POST-MORTEM

8/31/71

Dear Harold,

A couple notes re Post-Mortem.

First, I forgot to pull from the 3 files of PM additions and suggestions--those massive files I went through--some pages of typed notes I sent you pertaining to errors in PM II, which at that time was PM III. These include about all the errors I found in the book, and all will need to be corrected. They should be easy to spot, so when you get a chance, leaf through those files and pull my notes out to put with the new, briefer files of additions. If it is any help, the notes are dated 7/17, 7/19 and 7/21/70, with "POST MORTEM III" typed across the top. They are all together in one of the files, which I do not remember.

Second, if you are not aware of it, Sylvia has an excellent discussion of the anterior neck wound in her book. She goes into good detail on the doctors' original opinions which were that this was an entrance wound, then she explains the visits by the Secret Service, and finally the changes in Perry. It is a really fair account of the whole business, though I haven't indicated all she goes into.

Since so much of your discussion involves this information and since you have never really taken the time in any of your books to give the kind of documentation Sylvia does, I think it would be a very good idea if you inserted a reference to her book. The page no. are 149-159. This way, if the reader wants to check out exact and detailed sources for your assertions about the doctors' original statements and the changes and pressures put on them, he will be able do. I strongly believe you are required to document, and since the discussion in PM is not the place to go into this sort of detail, reference to Sylvia's book would fulfil your obligation as a writer to document and it would assist the reader who wishes to check. Also, you will be directing the reader to a source in which the evidence is put together in the proper manner and fairly represented.

I am in the midst of re-reading PM II (formerlyIII) and am more impressed with it than ever. It is a brilliant analysis. I would agree with you now that this need not be cut. However, it is lengthy, as the third part will be. For this reason alone, the first part must be as short as possible. Will write more on that when I can soon. My primary suggestion for the first part is to make it an expose of the working papers of the investigation. Boiled down and stripped of what is no longer relevant or necessary, this is essentially what the first is. If you structure it as such, it will really be dynamite, for you will be presenting, in the very words of the investigators, the proof of the cover-up and the prefabricated conclusions.

Rushed.

Harold